Info-Hams Digest   Wed, 7 Apr 93   Volume 93 : Issue 430

Today's Topics:
                    ARRL BULLETIN 37 ARLB037
                  Audio Tube Amp. RF Parasitics
           New Contact Qualifications (Was: DX 'n Stuff)
                       QSL routes needed
                 Re: RFD [rec.radio.amateur reorg]
                Rec.radio.reorg won't work, anyway.
                  vertical in the woods? (2 msgs)
                         Worked Him????

Date: Wed, 07 Apr 93 04:50:23 GMT
From: pacbell.com!att-out!att!linac!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mstar!n8emr!
bulletin@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 37 ARLB037
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

==
| Automatic relayed from packet radio via |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-895-2553 |
==

ZCZC AG78
QST DE W1AW
ARRL BULLETIN 37 ARLB037
FROM ARRL HEADQUARTERS NEWINGTON CT

APRIL 6, 1993
RELAYED BY KB8NW/OBS & BARF-80 BBS
TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS

SB QST ARL ARLB037
ARLB037 FCC DENIES REQUEST

THE FCC HAS DENIED A REQUEST BY AN ATTORNEY FOR RICHARD A. WHITE
JR., KA3T, TO HAVE HIS RECORD OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE COMMISSION
WITHDRAWN AND EXPUNGED.

WHITE WAS ONE OF EIGHT PACKET BULLETIN BOARD OPERATORS TO RECEIVE A
NOTICE OF VIOLATION IN JANUARY, 1991, FOR FORWARDING AN ''ALL USA''
MESSAGE WHICH THE FCC CALLED A BUSINESS MESSAGE.

THE NALS REQUIRED THAT THE PBBS OPERATORS EXPLAIN THE CIRCUMSTANCES
OF THE VIOLATION AND DESCRIBE WHAT STEPS THEY WOULD TAKE TO PREVENT
FUTURE VIOLATIONS. WHITE, THROUGH HIS LAWYER, RESPONDED TO THE FCC,
WHO IN APRIL, 1991, SAID THAT NO FURTHER ACTION WOULD BE TAKEN AND
DROPPED THE 300 DOLLAR FINE AGAINST WHITE SINCE HE HAD STATED THAT
NO ''ALL USA'' MESSAGES WOULD BE SENT BY HIS STATION WITHOUT PRIOR
SCREENING TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE RULES.

WHITE'S LAWYER SOUGHT TO HAVE THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WHITE AND
THE FCC REMOVED FROM HIS RECORDS BECAUSE NO ACTION AGAINST HIM
RESULTED, SAYING THAT HIS CLIENT WAS ENTITLED TO AN UNTAINTED RECORD
FREE OF ANY QUESTION CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF HIS STATION.

THE FCC ON MARCH 22, 1993, DENIED THAT REQUEST, CALLING IT
''UNWARRANTED.'' THE FCC SAID THAT IT DOES NOT CONSIDER A LICENSEE'S
FILE CONTAMINATED ''MERELY BY THE PRESENCE OF AN EXCHANGE OF
CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE COMMISSION AND THE LICENSEE.''

THE FCC CALLED THE EXCHANGE BETWEEN IT AND KA3T ''FRUITFUL, IN THAT
IT SHOWS WHITE AS A LICENSEE WHO TAKES SERIOUSLY THE RESPONSIBILITY
FOR STATION CONTROL.''
NNNN

Date: 6 Apr 93 22:57:33 GMT
From: access.usask.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!news@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Audio Tube Amp. RF Parasitics
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

    One day while working on one of my homebrew tube
audio power amplifiers, the ground prong on my 'scope probe

briefly touched the plate connection on one output
tube, while the amplifier was idle on my test bench.
The amp uses 12AX7 pre&phase-inv., 6SN7 driver, and
two 6550A's in class AB1 for outputs. The output xformer
is a Hammond 1650N (4300ohms CT). B+ is around 540V.

   Well, anyway the result was an instant silent arc occurring
between the contacts on the 6550 tube socket (just the one the
probe nicked). The arc stayed for a few seconds before my brain
figured out what had happened and then I hit the stand-by switch.

   The amplifier survived (new O/P's added anyway) but I was puzzled
as to why you could at least 20kV+. A bit of pondering and I figured
the parasitic LC's in the output transfomer and tube could get loose
and raise hell. I want to fix this bug but I wonder if anyone has
some advice. There are at least 3 ways to fix this:

   1. Add small air-core choke or 47ohm res. in series w/plate
connections.

   2. Add RC circuit between O/P tube's plate and control grid.

   3. Add RC circuit across each winding of O/P transformer
 primary windings. I know this is usually done to compensate
 for the xformer's self-inductance. But for RF ?

   4. The "grid-stop" resistor (~1k) monopolizes on the miller-
effect, but I think it limits the tubes bandwidth wrt to it's
input signal, not wrt to the tube itself. In other words, this
appears to be a useless "cure-all" popular nowadays in audio.

    After looking at several old amp schematics, I found ones from
 the 40's and very few afterward included any of these 3 fixes. These
RF stoppers are simple enough but what about actual values? This
is also a problem for HAM high-power transmitters, as the high-
voltage at the parasitic resonance can easily fry $$$$ of tubes.

Ken

email: sidhu@bode.ee.ualberta.ca

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 19:18:41 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!lynx!lkay@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: New Contact Qualifications (Was: DX 'n Stuff)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr7.122809.17286@wam.umd.edu>,
   ham@wam.umd.edu (Scott Richard Rosenfeld) writes:

> In article <1993Apr7.074947.5416@usl.edu>
>   cfm1471@ucs.usl.edu (Morrison Charles F) writes:
>
> >New qualifications of logging contacts, domestic or DX. You need not
> >copy the callsign! Just dream it up, find them in the callbook and
> >QSL them! Thats it! How hard can it be?
> >
>
> Hey! guess what! I just worked KC4AAA and 1S0AT and VK0HF on 160 meter phone,
> with only 5 watts and a dipole!
>
> Time to submit for my 6-band QRP, DXCC honor roll!!!
>

There's one big difference. Jeff is IN the KP1's log. You're NOT in their logs.

I can't believe this thread is still going......

Len

    PS, I'd take Jeff's QSO over a NET QSO   ANY DAY!!!!!!!

 Dr. Leonard Kay, KB2R | "But we are not dealing with the
 Electrical and Computer Engineering | normal world. We are chasing DX."
 Northeastern University, Boston | -- W9KNI, 'The Complete DXer'
 NU ARC: W1KBN 145.31(-) |
 Packet: KB2R@K1EA | #include <disclaimer.h>

Date: Wed, 07 Apr 93 15:03:23 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!yale.edu!ira.uka.de!
news.dfn.de!hpux.rz.uni-jena.de!th-ilmenau.RZ.TH-Ilmenau.DE!systemtechnik.tu-
ilmenau.de!tom@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: QSL routes needed
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr6.203543.9612@en.ecn.purdue.edu>, n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu
(Scott A Stembaugh) writes:
|>
|>

```
|> Could some kind soul please forward me the QSL routes for 7p8sr, v31rl, and
|> yu2dx?
|>
|> tnx es vry 73
|> --scott
|> --
|> Scott Stembaugh - N9LJX        internet: n9ljx@ecn.purdue.edu
|> Operations Supervisor, ADPC    phone:    317 494 7946
|> Purdue University
|> West Lafayette, IN 47907-1061
7p8sr - ny3n
v31rl - ng7s

SOURCE:
QSL-Routes, World Annual of QSL Managers.1993. Theuberger Verlag Berlin,Germany.


--
+--------------------------------------------------------------------------+
| Thomas Planke                      Planke@Systemtechnik.TU-Ilmenau.DE |
| - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -|
| Technical University Ilmenau                 Phone: +49 3677/69-1465     |
| Dept. of Automation and Systems Engineering  Fax:   +49 3677/69-1446
          |
| PF 327,Am Ehrenberg,D-06300 Ilmenau,Germany                              |
| - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -|
|                                    (PacketRadio: DL5ATP@DB0RSV.DEU.EURO)|
+--------------------------------------------------------------------------+


------------------------------


Date: Mon, 5 Apr 1993 21:01:49 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hplextra!hpfcso!hplvec!
scott@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Re: RFD [rec.radio.amateur reorg]
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:

>Such a pessimistic view of the world...  Things can work much better than
>that.  In rec.aviation.*, which was reorganized last Summer, my news spool
>shows 13 newsgroups with 336 files (5-day retention.)  Of those, 41 are
>cross-posted between more than one rec.aviation subgroup.  Most of those seem
>to be from an attempt to find the most appropriate groups for the topic.  Only
>26 of those even include rec.aviation.misc in the cross-posting.

ACCHH!  PTUI!!  Put me down as adamantly apposed!!!

As a long time rec.aviation participant, allow me to present a slightly
```

different viewpoint from Ian's. I dislike much of the rec.aviation
hierarchy!

A few of the new groups work, and don't generate copious xposts. These
are the groups that are *clearly distinct* and stand on their own, such
as .military, .soaring, .homebuilt and .simulators. The rest
(.piloting, .owning, .products, .answers, .student, .stories, and .misc)
represent xposting hell. I appreciate the statistics Ian presents, but
xposting tends to ebb and flow in the hierarchy. If you factor out the
few well divided groups, the percentage would rise appreciably. I've
seen times when *most* of what was posted in the .piloting, .owning, .ifr,
.student, .products, .stories and .misc groups was xposted to at least
one other group.

>That sure doesn't seem like an epidemic of cross-posting. Considering that
>rec.aviation before its reorg was very much like rec.radio.amateur.misc today
>(including traffic volume and attached mail lists) I really don't think it's
>going to be a problem.

That assumes appropriate sub-groups. To my mind, the subgroupings
offered are no more distinct than the less succesfully split
rec.aviation groups.

>So, if we *do* split rec.radio.amateur, we'll have several other groups with
>better signal-to-noise ratios, making a much more enjoyable environment for
>Hams, considers what varied interests we tend to have.

>It CAN work... just look at where it has worked.

Sorry Ian. I'm truly not trying to be contrary, but I believe you're
operating from a false premise. I respectfully disagree.

Scott Turner N0VRF scott@hpisla.LVLD.HP.COM
HP VXI Systems Division
Turbo Arrow N2134N "Baby"

Date: 7 Apr 93 16:47:51 GMT
From: zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!usenet.coe.montana.edu!
ogicse!usenet.ee.pdx.edu!fastrac.llnl.gov!wsrcc.com!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!
psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@sdd.hp.com
Subject: Rec.radio.reorg won't work, anyway.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:
>emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca writes:

```
>>Given our experience with rec.radio.policy, which by any criteria
>>has been a dismal failure at moving policy discussions off of
>>r.r.a.m., however, why are those of you proposing the split
>>confident that more newsgroups will work?
>
>We've already been through this point several times.  Yes,
>rec.radio.amateur.policy has not accomplished its goal because it was intended
>to be a dumping ground for an unwanted topic.

I think this somewhat overstates the case.  From the perspective of
improving the signal-to-noise ratio of r.r.a.misc, yes, r.r.a.policy
has been a failure.  But applying the same test to r.r.a.policy that
is being applied to the proposed groups gives a somewhat better result.
There are at present several ongoing policy discussions in r.r.a.policy.
(76 articles in the past week, by my count).  Yes, there's some flamage,
too, but I wouldn't characterize the level of flamage as being
damagingly high.  The level of traffic--including the level of
flamage--varies with time, of course, but over all r.r.a.policy seems
to be picking up steam and becoming more of a useful group.  It still
isn't removing all--or nearly all--of the "policy" discussion from
r.r.a.misc, which is why I don't consider it an unqualified success,
but I think it is not an overall failure.  In light of the fact that
the name r.r.a.policy isn't particularly enlightening (I know: so think
of a better one, fella!), this to me bodes well for the proposed split.

>>All that will occur is that EVERYBODY will cross-post to a
>>r.r.a.m. as well as the specific group.
>
>Cross-posting is too much work for most users.  They won't do it in the
>numbers you fear.  Some will, but it will most likely be insignificant
>compared to the regular traffic in the groups.

I agree.  Why should people xpost between all of the r.r.a.* groups
any more than they already xpost between the r.r.a.* and other
groups?  Some level of unreasonable crossposting will always be with
us.  That is not, in itself, a reason to deny ourselves the benefits
of a well-chosen heirarchy of news groups.
-------
Jon Bloom, KE3Z              |  jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League  |    Justice is being allowed to do whatever
225 Main St.                 |    I like.  Injustice is whatever prevents
Newington, CT 06111          |    my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson


------------------------------

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 13:33:00 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: vertical in the woods?
```

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr6.081407.3917@ccsvax.sfasu.edu> f_speerjr@ccsvax.sfasu.edu
writes:
>I have several acres of pine woods, and would like to stick a phased array of
>verticals on 10 mhz in it. But I'm worried about absorbtion by all those pine
>trees. Yet I note in the literature recommendations for wire vertical antennas
>hanging directly from tree branches, where the antenna element would be only
>two or three feet from the support tree. I could probably arrange the same
>spacing, although there would be a good many trees BETWEEN the individual
>verticals.

The pines will play havoc with the antenna pattern when they are wet,
but when they are dry they won't absorb too much of the signal. Of course
putting the antenna farm on open land is ideal, but we rarely find
ideal conditions. You'll find seasonal changes in performance with the
vegetation present that may affect antenna tuning. Still, I'd say go
for it.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 13:12:10 GMT
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!linac!att!att-out!cbfsb!
cbnewsb.cb.att.com!feg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: vertical in the woods?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr6.081407.3917@ccsvax.sfasu.edu> f_speerjr@ccsvax.sfasu.edu
writes:
>
>I have several acres of pine woods, and would like to stick a phased array of
>verticals on 10 mhz in it. But I'm worried about absorbtion by all those pine
>trees. Yet I note in the literature recommendations for wire vertical antennas
>hanging directly from tree branches, where the antenna element would be only
>two or three feet from the support tree. I could probably arrange the same
>spacing, although there would be a good many trees BETWEEN the individual
>verticals.
>
>Anybody got any relevant experience/suggestions?
>

>Thenks and 73!
>-Jim-, K5YUT

No problem. I ran a 7MHz and a 3.5MHz 4-square vertical
array for years amid 70 foot oak, hickory and hemlock trees.
I took very precise measurements of a 7MHz vertical among
the trees and another one exactly like it away from the
trees, each with 120 1/4 w.l. radials. No difference
in their self-impedances noted.

As a guess, I would say that effects from trees would occur
as the frequency was raised and that perhaps by the time
one came to 28MHz there would be some. However, a ground
mounted vertical at 28MHz isn't such a good idea even
in the clear, if more optimum results are the objective.

Forrest Gehrke feg@dodger.att.com k2bt

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 13:32:35 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Worked Him????
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

   Without certain copy of the callsign, there is no route to obtain a
QSL card without external help of one kind or another.

   Perhaps the original poster's purpose was to find out if he really
did hear something from xxxx, where he thought there was no activity?
curiosity is a common enough human trait.
   If the purpose was to get another country for an award, then relying
on the usenet to get the callsign seems not to be in the spirit of the
game, nevermind the rules. Asking in such a public place would be
terribly naive if he was hunting an award, someone's bound to have
tipped off the DXCC by now.

    Personally, I have a sliding scale of merit for QSO's.

     "I found it out of the blue" comes top

     " I got through a pile-up I came across"

     "I'd heard/read there might be an expedition...."

     "The cluster said xxxxx was on 14.... right NOW!"

      "yyyyyy called on 2m/landline to tell me... "

" The pileup policeman told me it was my turn.."

    " xxxx made sure we got the details right"

    .

    .

    " He never replied to me, but I sent a QSL anyway, got one back"

                         ETC.

   Some folk do things honourably, but sufficient do not, so awards are
somewhat tarnished nowadays. This is unfair to the honourable people.

   Perhaps DXCC is becoming more of a test of postal prowess?

   Just where on the scale above is the threshold one accepts is a
matter of personal opinion.

   Cheers
            David   GM4ZNX

Date: 7 Apr 93 14:57:17 GMT
From: deccrl!news.crl.dec.com!random!e2big.mko.dec.com!peavax.mlo.dec.com!
usenet@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9303302139.AA09642@ucsd.edu>, <1993Apr1.225218.21618@pixar.com>,
<1993Apr6.070302.3916@ccsvax.sfasu.edu>big.mko
Subject : Re: ARRL living in the past?

In article <1993Apr6.070302.3916@ccsvax.sfasu.edu>, f_speerjr@ccsvax.sfasu.edu
says:
>There's no doubt the *original* usage of XYL was what we would now think to be
>sexist. It actually stood for ex-young-lady, and distinguished the person
>referred to from a YL -- young lady -- an unmarried woman, a "miss." Usage now,
>of course, parallels Mr. with Ms., and no longer makes that distinction.
>
>However, words constantly change their meaning. For example, according to my
>OED, "woman" itself comes from the old english "wifmon," meaning a wife, or
>potential wife, and therefore carrying with it the implication of women as some
>man's property. That sense of "woman" is rapidly disappearing, however, and I

>don't know of any particular movement to get rid of the word itself. Similarly,
>could we not come to think of XYL (or YL, if you like) as standing for MS? If
>you want to make a change parallel to MRS, MISS --> MS, how about XL? I just
>think there's some value to our hobby to hanging on to, or only gradually
>modifying, those of our traditions we can hang on to.
>
>For what it's worth...
>
>73! -Jim-

But MS is so much easier to send CW wise than XYL.

Jeff McLeman   mcleman@zso.dec.com
KD1IT / 7   jeffm@kd1it.ampr.org
Redmond, Wa.

Date: 6 Apr 93 23:35:37 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr5.173927.3372@ve6mgs.ampr.org>,
<HaFL2B1w165w@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com>, <C52vz5.4os@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>
Subject : Re: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization

jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:
>In article <HaFL2B1w165w@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com> ben@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com (Ben
Coleman) writes:
>>Not everyone reads news on a Unix box. I'm running POW(Plain Ol' Waffle),
>>and on my machine, cross-posted articles get read multiple times, in each
>>cross-posted newsgroup. I'm personally in favor of a split, but the
>>argument that no one will read cross-posted messages more than once doesn't
>>wash.
>
>It is an oft repeated maxim, and one that bears repeating again:
>Get your software fixed.

He can't. There aren't many ways to do uucp, news, and mail on a PC running
DOS. (If you've got a 386 or above, I'd suggest looking into Linux - it's
POSIX and it's free. See comp.os.linux for details.) But on a 286 or below,
waffle is pretty much the only real choice. So, users can't fix it - they
pretty much have to bear with what the author(s) distribute.

It isn't ideal. Its deficiencies are why they are called "waffle irons" by
Unix users. But it's a way to get news and mail if nothing else is available.

However, the NetNews community is not going to lower its expectations
because of waffle's appearance on the scene with the inability to handle news
articles according to the de-facto standards. So, while it isn't right to
say "Get your software fixed" to a waffle user, neither is it correct to
change any proposals just for waffle. At some point, you will need to send
input to the authors saying you want proper handling of cross-posted articles
because they are a reality - and in the cases they were designed for, they are
even useful. Once they fix it, the problem will be solved for all of us.
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL   Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com   Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: Wed, 7 Apr 1993 13:37:01 GMT
From: caen!uvaarpa!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!jeg7e@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <HaFL2B1w165w@nj8j.blackwlf.mese.com>,
<C52vz5.4os@murdoch.acc.Virginia.EDU>, <6e.Y03fHcfwf00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>
Subject : Re: RFD: rec.radio.amateur reorganization

In article <6e.Y03fHcfwf00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com> ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian
Kluft) writes:
>
>jeg7e@livia.acs.Virginia.EDU (Jon Gefaell) writes:
>>
>>It is an oft repeated maxim, and one that bears repeating again:
>>Get your software fixed.
>
>He can't. There aren't many ways to do uucp, news, and mail on a PC running
>DOS. (If you've got a 386 or above, I'd suggest looking into Linux - it's
>POSIX and it's free. See comp.os.linux for details.) But on a 286 or below,
>waffle is pretty much the only real choice. So, users can't fix it - they
>pretty much have to bear with what the author(s) distribute.
>
>It isn't ideal. Its deficiencies are why they are called "waffle irons" by
>Unix users. But it's a way to get news and mail if nothing else is available.
>
>However, the NetNews community is not going to lower its expectations
>because of waffle's appearance on the scene with the inability to handle news
>articles according to the de-facto standards. So, while it isn't right to
>say "Get your software fixed" to a waffle user, neither is it correct to
>change any proposals just for waffle. At some point, you will need to send

>input to the authors saying you want proper handling of cross-posted articles
>because they are a reality - and in the cases they were designed for, they are
>even useful. Once they fix it, the problem will be solved for all of us.

Uhm, with all due respect, doesn't that mean 'Get your software fixed' ???

I understand the fellow probably isn't about to get out the C compiler
and start fixing things, but if he wants things to work right...

--

These opinions may not be unique, and they may not express the views of U.Va.

```
   --------------------------------------------------------
   | Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \      /___ | SILENCE = DEATH
   | Security and Technology Planning R&D     \   /   / |  Hate is *NOT*
   | I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \ /   /  | a Family Value!
   | The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall      \/\ /   | --------------
   ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~\/~~~~~  73 de KD4CQY
```

Date: 7 Apr 93 07:56:38 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!rouge!
cfm1471@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Apr3.010600.9905@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <1pl679INNfs6@hp-
col.col.hp.com>, <1993Apr5.144739.12511@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>
Subject : Re: Worked Him????

In article <1993Apr5.144739.12511@cbnewsm.cb.att.com> jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com
(jeffrey.n.jones) writes:
>In article <1pl679INNfs6@hp-col.col.hp.com> bobw@col.hp.com (Bob Witte) writes:
>>jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) writes:
>>> NF6?/KP1. Knew that he was on Navassa island after consulting my chart
>>> of calls and had his call just missing one letter. Let's see, oh yes, I
>>> heard him, he heard me, I sent him a report, he sent me a report. Hmmm,
>>> sounds like a contact to me. Maybe not a perfect one. Anyway in the
>>> log it goes and a QSL card is on it's way. As this is the second comment
>>> I have had on the validity of QSO all I can say is "Sorry guys, it's
>>> valid to me and to the DX and that's all that really matters." 73!
>>>
>>   Wow. I've heard disagreement on what constitutes a legit contact
>>   before but this is the first time I've heard someone claim
>>   that you don't even have to copy the other station's callsign.
>>   Sorry, dude.
>
>I guess if you get a QSL card from another ham and you find that you had

>copied his call wrong, you would tear up his card and not respond? Sheesh
>first time I have had the nitpickers turn their sorry guns on me. As
>I said, my card in the mail to him and all the "Sorry dudes" who made
>comments, whoops, make that those who said "Sorry dude" comments won't
>matter in the least when that card is on my wall. Also, as I have better
>things to do then read idiot nitpicking comments about the above subject
>this now goes in my KILL file where I should have put it long ago.
>
>Jeff
>sorry remarks and
>--

Where did you get his call to qsl him?

Charlie

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #430
****